

Report from the second informal group meeting for GTR on controls, tell-tales and indicators

Meeting on 19 October. 0930 hours- 1300; 1545 - 1930

Participants

Chairman: Erario (Italy)

Secretariat: Choda (IMMA)

India: Balaraman, Urdhwareshe

EU: Delneufcuort

Canada: Lalime

US: Nguyen

IMMA: Dutrieux

China: Hu

Japan: Suzuki; JASIC – Kubota, Tanahashi; NISEL - Matsumura;

Germany: Gerlach

Document reviewed

MCSYM-02-01, Draft proposal for GTR on controls, tell-tales and indicators

MCSYM-02-02, Draft Supplement to GTR

MCSYM-02-03, proposed time plan

MCSYM-02-04, EU Comments

MCSYM-02-05, Comments from India on GTR

MCSYM-02-06, Agenda for 2/MCSYM WG

MCSYM-02-07, Comments from IMMA

MCSYM-02-08, Comments from Canada on GTR

MCSYM-02-09, collation of comments from India, EU, Canada and IMMA

Summary:

- Canada noted that their regulation did not differentiate between motorcycle categories and would prefer the GTR to be linked to Category 3 rather be specific to Category 3.3.
- IMMA suggested that the time-frame required to further investigate the other sub-categories, other than 3.3, would be too great to allow development of this GTR.
- Canada, even though recognizing the 1998 agreement and the implementation of GTRS, questioned whether the GTR should not include the most stringent requirements (i.e. Canada/US) and allow other nations to opt out of the GTR
- Canada suggested that optical warning devices would not be permissible in their markets as it was illegal to change the intensity of the headlamp and have switching. IMMA requested to justify the need of these devices
- The US/Canada raised issues for controls where the following situation applied “on the left handlebar for vehicles with a gear selection control operated independently of a hand operated clutch, on right handlebar for vehicles with gear

- selection located on the left handlebar and operated in conjunction with the hand operated clutch" because in their markets, they could only be on left handlebar and had suggested that they did not want to give their market the option of putting it anywhere else.
- European Commission, proposed that editorial changes of “must” be replaced by “shall”
 - Members agreed that there should be continuity with other regulations especially with light regulations and that amber colour should be maintained rather than yellow suggested by EU. US requested that definitions of the colours for the tell-tales be provided to clearly define which green, amber, red colours should be used.
 - US requested that an additional text was added to the preamble / introduction – “Travelers must be able to operate motorcycles safely, even if they cannot understand the language of the country they are visiting. *Several Contracting Parties are currently mandating the use of the national language as an alternative means of marking controls. This option shall be allowed when the GTR is implemented by such administrations*”
 - Members agreed to US proposal to delete the “WORDS” column in Table 1, as it suggested that these were the only words allowed for the symbols. The Secretariat agreed that the table would re-designed to ensure the words could not be associated with the symbols.
 - Members had agreed that this GTR would be aligned to R60 rather R121
 - Members agreed that all comments would be sent to the secretariat by 18 December so that a formal document could be prepared by mid-January to GRSG
 - The aim was still to have a formal document presented to November 2011 WP29 meeting.

Procedurally, Members agreed that they would raise their comments as per MCSYM-02-09 which the Informal Group would discuss and then accept or disagree as changes to the proposed text of the GTR (document MCSYM-02-01) The detail of the changes are in Annex 1.

Attachment 1. MCSYM-02-01 Rev1, updated text of the GTR incorporating the changes accepted at 2/MCSYM meeting on 19 October 2010.

RChoda

Annex 1. Detail of the discussions on the comments raised on the GTR:**: A, Introduction**

- I – EU, India, IMMA comments accepted
- III - India, IMMA comments accepted
- IV – Canada comments accepted
- V - India, IMMA comments accepted

: B,

1 Scope - India comments accepted

2 Application – EU, India, IMMA accepted (Canada; applicability to Category 3 only)

3 Definitions

3.3, Canada comment rejected, align with R60 rather than R121. Definition kept

3.4, IMMA proposal to add new definitions to align with R60 accepted

3.6, Canada comment rejected, align with R60 rather than R121. Definition kept

3.7, Canada comment rejected, align with R60 rather than R121. Definition kept

4 Requirements

4.1 Canada suggested that the use of “if fitted” would make the requirement not being mandatory and proposed the addition of new clause was rejected as this was not mandatory and only applicable when or if fitted.

4.2.1, same comment as 4.1

4.2.2, same comment as 4.1

4.2.3, IMMA correction to cross reference agreed

4.2.4, India and Canada comments accepted,

- US concern on IMMA comment to add after "direction indicators" should read as follows "supplemental engine stop, audible warning device, brakes and clutch must be always accessible to the driver as primary function of the corresponding control without the removal of the driver's hands from the respective handgrips." .
- US to comment on the IMMA additional text.

4.2.5, Canada comments to delete this clause accepted, as it already covered in the '98 agreement paragraphs. 4, 6 and in article 7.6

4.3

4.3.1, IMMA comments accepted, text added and note deleted.

4.3.2, continued discussion over whether a word was a symbol and how the text should enable the CP to prescribe, symbols or supplementary words or both, US preferred the text that had been used in previous discussions and it was agreed to use . *“Several Contracting Parties are currently mandating the use of the national language as an alternative means of marking controls. This option shall be allowed when the GTR is implemented by such administrations”*

4.3.3, India proposal was rejected as the note under 4.3.1 had been deleted and it was agreed to maintain the text.

4.3.5, EU India and Canada comments were accepted

4.3.7. IMMA comments rejected to add 2 new clauses

4.4

4.4.1, Canada and IMMA comments accepted

4.4.2, EU and IMMA comments accepted. US concerned that this would not be acceptable in US and requested for the text to be placed in [square brackets]

- India comment accepted to insert a new clause 4.4.3 with text
- 4.5
- 4.5.1 IMMA comment accepted
- 4.5.2 all comments referring to the correct cross-reference accepted
- 4.5.3 all comments referring to the correct cross-reference accepted
- 4.5.3.2, EU and Canada comments rejected to align with current regulation and maintain “amber”
- 4.6, agreed that the clause should be deleted and the text moved to the pre-amble as it more informative than a requirement
- 4.7, EU and Canada comments accepted. US request for some text to be square brackets similar concern as 4.4.2

Table 1

- Members agreed to US proposal to delete the “WORDS” column in Table 1, as it suggested that these were the only words allowed for the symbols. The Secretariat agreed that the table would be re-designed to ensure the words could not be associated with the symbols.
 1. India and IMMA comments accepted
 2. Canada and IMMA comments accepted
 3. EU rejected
 4. EU / Canada amber to yellow rejected, India comment on Optional manual choke accepted
 5. no comments
 6. India and IMMA comments accepted
 7. Agreed to delete this item
 8. IMMA comments, Canada would check on the current developments in the Canadian market on the acceptability of IMMA comments
 9. IMMA comments accepted but *IMMA to provide justification to US and Canada for proposal to allow the horn on opposite handlebar*
 10. Canada and IMMA comments accepted
 11. IMMA comments accepted
 12. IMMA comments accepted with reservation from Canada on the legality of the optical warning device in Canada. *IMMA requested for justification for deletion or maintaining this item.*
 13. Agreed that it should be aligned to T53 and the rear fog lamp be used with the front lamp as optional
 14. EU / Canada amber to yellow rejected
 15. India and Canada proposal plus IMMA proposals for columns 5 and 8 accepted
 16. India comment rejected but request to *India to consider that both hazard warnings should be allowed*
 17. India comment noted. *Canada to propose a note for optional tell-tales.* IMMA comments accepted.
 18. India comment noted. *Canada to propose a note for optional tell-tales.*
 19. India comment noted. *Canada to propose a note for optional tell-tales.*

20. EU / Canada amber to yellow rejected, IMMA comment accepted
21. EU , Canada, IMMA comments accepted
22. Canada proposal to align name to electrical charging
23. Canada proposal to align to R60 accepted
24. India and IMMA comments accepted. US/Canada proposal to add “cruise control” to title to align with 4.3.6 accepted
25. IMMA comment accepted
26. IMMA comments accepted. IMMA to confirm the applicability with US and Canadian authorities
27. IMMA comments accepted. Need confirmation from US on acceptability
28. IMMA comments accepted
29. Canada and IMMA comments accepted
30. EU, India, IMMA comments accepted. Noted that cut-off is at vehicles less than 200cc (as in Japan cut-off at 150cc) – US and Canada concern with the shift patterns as some are not permitted in the US and want to avoid the options that US deem to be unsafe and avoid endorsement of these practice
31. India, IMMA comments were accepted. Noted that cut-off is at vehicles less than 200cc (as in Japan cut-off at 150cc) – US and Canada concern with the shift patterns as some are not permitted in the US and want to avoid the options that US deem to be unsafe and avoid endorsement of these practice
32. India, IMMA comments were accepted. Noted that cut-off is at vehicles less than 200cc (as in Japan cut-off at 150cc) – US and Canada concern with the shift patterns as some are not permitted in the US and want to avoid the options that US deem to be unsafe and avoid endorsement of these practice
33. EU and India comments not accepted
34. EU proposal for addition of “Emissions related Malfunction Indicator Lamp” accepted